

**SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA WETLANDS RESTORATION PROGRAM  
WETLANDS MONITORING GROUP**

**MEETING SUMMARY  
FEBRUARY 11, 2003**

**Attendees:**

Andree Breaux (San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board)  
John Brosnan (Wetlands Restoration Program)  
Josh Collins (San Francisco Estuary Institute)  
Maggi Kelly (University of California at Berkeley)  
Karl Malamud-Roam (Contra Costa Mosquito and Vector Control District)  
Molly Martindale (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers)  
Mike May (San Francisco Estuary Institute)  
Mike Monroe (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency)  
Chris Potter (California Resources Agency)  
Stuart Siegel (Wetlands and Water Resources)  
Eric Tattersall (California Department of Fish and Game)  
Louisa Valiela (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency)

**1. Introductions/Review Agenda**

Molly Martindale chaired the meeting and opened the discussion with a roundtable of introductions.

**2. Update on WRP Issues**

Molly stated that members of the Management Group and the Executive Council are working through some details of the Wetlands Restoration Program's Working Principles.

The CALFED funding has come through for monitoring of birds, plants, physical processes, and landscape. Monitoring will take place at two CALFED sites each in the Delta, Suisun, and San Pablo Bay.

The National Estuarine Research Reserve (NERR) program in the Bay-Delta is coming online. The program will establish research sites at China Camp state park, Brown's Island Regional Shoreline, and Rush Ranch Open Space Preserve.

**3. Draft Interim WRMP Functional Diagram**

Molly presented a draft diagram of the Wetlands Monitoring Group Working Functions. The Diagram showed the Wetlands Monitoring Group: potentially developing an expanded compliance survey; developing 2-3 useable protocols; supporting the continued development of the California Rapid Assessment Method (CRAM); and, focusing on the completion of the Active Bay Wetlands Map. The Wetlands Monitoring Group will act as a forum, where group members exchange information and ideas about these items listed and general monitoring issues around the bay. Stuart Siegel stated this it is critical to get project information available

**WETLANDS MONITORING GROUP MEETING SUMMARY**  
**02/11/03**

online that is in a regulatory context. Mike May referred to the two-sided data sheet being planned and stated that the data collected will need quality control.

Josh Collins mentioned that there will be a meeting next week between Point Reyes Bird Observatory staff and San Francisco Estuary Institute staff to discuss bird data protocols.

#### **4. Database Issues**

Mike May presented the status of the Wetlands Mapping project, which can be found at [www.wrmp.org](http://www.wrmp.org). The ultimate goal is to provide something that is useable by the public. At the site, users are able to download a draft framework and protocols and will be able to view that data in Microsoft Word format or in PDF. The Mapping Project's move to the website was made possible by funds from the San Francisco Estuary Project. Future actions with the website will be the combination of the north and south bay maps (completed by Stuart Siegel) combined and placed online. The remaining funds would go to build functionality into the existing maps and mapped projects; there are no additional funds that could be applied to add new projects to those already mapped. Users are able to click on a project and get a list of files associated with that project.

Stuart asked about including an advanced function for advanced users. Karl Malamud-Roam stated that the group of users will vary widely. Mike stated that this is a possibility for the future, but that we are starting with a simple interface. Karl suggested that since there will have to be a QA/QC process associated with data that gets fed into the system that all data/reports should be flagged as either "preliminary" or "verified" data. Andree asked if there would be a list of everything being monitored on the site; Mike said that there would be a complete list. Mike stated that there will be a set of information on SFEI's website that will be separate from other agencies' websites, which is a chart, dynamically linked to all the data, that tracks the progress toward achieving the *Habitat Goals*. Karl pointed out that the chart only shows a snapshot, and does not represent the net change in habitat over time. He added that we need to query management and determine what their key issues are. This information can be distilled and used for a needs assessment of what this website should be.

Mike May and Karl stated that there is a need to be consistent with other data sets outside of this effort. Molly and Mike Monroe suggested using those boundaries found in the *Habitat Goals* report. Andree asked how the group can inform project applicants to go to and use the database. Mike May indicated that the information could be available on their permit application, but there is no money to do this yet. Maggi Kelly suggested including photographs from the individual sites. Karl added the group must be open to this as a prototype and not to consider this to be the end product; it could change in the future. Josh added that if people in the group have preferences for the function and appearance of the database that they should voice those opinions. Mike May stated that a focus group specific to website design could be helpful.

Karl stated it is critical to link this effort with those of the NERR program and CALFED efforts. He added the need to advertise what we've got and repeated that a needs assessment is critical. Molly suggested that a staff person in addition to Mike May would be of great assistance. Chris Potter suggested that funding for such a position could come from the Coastal Conservancy's

**WETLANDS MONITORING GROUP MEETING SUMMARY**  
**02/11/03**

Bay Restoration Program. Josh stated that they had been approached in the past - when this was not a priority for them - but that now might be a better time. Stuart mentioned that the Sea Grant program is calling for proposals right now. Stuart and Karl suggested that Ducks Unlimited and the Joint Venture should be included at an upcoming Monitoring Group meeting. **The group determined that Marc Holmes should be invited to the next meeting.**

Molly provided a recap of the meeting and stated that the group will continue to act as a forum, with less of a spotlight on focus teams than in the past. Molly walked again through the functional diagram. Karl stated that the plan is a good monitoring skeleton and suggested that a potential focus on geology and geodetic protocols. Andree stressed the need to emphasize the basic, baseline needs are required in monitoring. Mike May said that, at [www.wrmp.org](http://www.wrmp.org), these are current, definitive protocols. Karl suggested that written OK should be obtained from the authors of these protocols before they are posted on the web.

Mike Monroe stated this it is imperative to get something available to people that is finalized, perhaps at least one finished protocol. This would have to be supported by the group and recognized by the author before being incorporated into the wetlands map. Molly said someone needs to create a standardized data sheet. Josh stated that this was part of the WRMP data collection protocol and that these could be ready to go. Karl and Stuart recognized the need for a procedure for determining if the protocols achieve the end goals.

John Collins provided a brief update on CRAM. The CRAM is one Part of a three-part approach to wetland inventories and assessment developed by the U.S. EPA, with input from the NWI of USFWS. Level 1 is a GIS-based inventory; Level 2 is the Rapid Assessment Method (called CRAM in California), and Level 3 is the intensive site-specific science needed to substantiate Levels 1 and 2. Josh stated that a proposal had been submitted on the previous Friday to study non-bay wetlands. Josh said that the current baylands data will be converted to NWI standards and that when uplands assessment begins, it will use the NWI format as a base. Presently, the Bay Area, Central Coast, and South Coast regions are working together and progress will then progress upland from the coast. Josh added that for Level 3, metric narratives are being developed in draft form. Josh said that regulatory agencies have begun to view CRAM as a cost-effective means of monitoring.

## **5. Next Meeting Date**

The group decided that meetings would be shifted to the afternoons of the second Tuesdays of each month. **The next meeting will take place in the afternoon of Tuesday, March 11 (exact time will be forwarded closer to the meeting date). Agenda items for the next meeting include: a website demonstration, EMAP updates, and potentially a visit from Marc Holmes.**